



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,470	07/01/1999	RONALD JOHNSTON HILL	53-99	2471

23713 7590 10/21/2002

GREENLEE WINNER AND SULLIVAN P C
5370 MANHATTAN CIRCLE
SUITE 201
BOULDER, CO 80303

EXAMINER

MURPHY, JOSEPH F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1646

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002 21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/346,470

Applicant(s)

HILL ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph F Murphy

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 40-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 52,53 and 60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-51,54-59 and 61-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 17.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1646

DETAILED ACTION

Formal Matters

Claims 1-39 were cancelled, and new claims 40-78 were added in Paper No. 20, 8/8/2002.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's elected with traverse Group IV, claims 1-7, 9, 12-18, 20, 22-29, 31-32 drawn to a nucleic acid encoding a protein with the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 10, a vector, a host cell, and a method of hybridization in Paper No. 15, 12/10/2001. This restriction was made final in Paper No. 16, 2/22/2002. Newly submitted claims 52, 53, 60 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the nucleic acids and proteins are structurally and functionally distinct, and thus do not have a shared technical feature.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 52, 53 and 60 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03. Claims 40-51, 54-59, 61-78 are under consideration.

Response to Amendment

The rejections of the cancelled claims have been rendered moot and are thus withdrawn.

Art Unit: 1646

Claim Objections

Claims 62, 64, 65 are objected to because of the following informalities: They are drawn to a non-elected invention. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 first paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 40-51, 54-59, 68-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid of SEQ ID NO: 10, or a nucleic acid with the sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 9, does not reasonably provide enablement for a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a bioactive derivative or analogue of SEQ ID NO: 10, or a nucleic acid which is 70% identical to SEQ ID NO: 10. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 40-51, 54-59, 68-74 are overly broad since insufficient guidance is provided as to which of the myriad of variant nucleic acids encode polypeptides which will retain the characteristics of EcR. Applicants do not disclose any actual or prophetic examples on expected performance parameters of any of the possible muteins of EcR. It is known in the art that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function. It is also known in the art that a single amino acid change in a protein's sequence can drastically affect the structure of the protein and the

Art Unit: 1646

architecture of an entire cell. For example, Voet et al. (1990) teaches that a single Glu to Val substitution in the beta subunit of hemoglobin causes the hemoglobin molecules to associate with one another in such a manner that, in homozygous individuals, erythrocytes are altered from their normal discoid shape and assume the sickle shape characteristic of sickle-cell anemia, causing hemolytic anemia and blood flow blockages (pages 126-128, section 6-3A and page 230, column 2, first paragraph).

Since the claims encompass variant nucleic acids and given the art recognized unpredictability of the effect of mutations on protein function, it would require undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. The factors considered to be relevant in the instant case are set forth below:

(1) the breadth of the claims - The claims are drawn to a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a bioactive derivative or analogue of SEQ ID NO: 10, or a nucleic acid which is 70% identical to SEQ ID NO: 10.

(2) the nature of the invention - The instant invention is a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a bioactive derivative or analogue of SEQ ID NO: 10, or a nucleic acid which is 70% identical to SEQ ID NO: 10.

(3) the state of the prior art - The Voet reference demonstrates that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function.

Art Unit: 1646

(5) the level of predictability in the art - The Voet reference demonstrates the unpredictability of the protein art.

(6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor - Applicant has only taught a nucleic acid with a sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 10, and the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 9.

(7) the existence of working examples - Working examples are not provided for ECR.

(8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. Given the breadth of claims 40-51, 54-59, 68-74 in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the level of skill of the artisan, and the guidance provided in the instant specification and the prior art of record, it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Claims 40-51, 54-59, 68-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

These are genus claims. The claims are drawn to a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a bioactive derivative or analogue of SEQ ID NO: 10, or a nucleic acid which is 70%

Art Unit: 1646

identical to SEQ ID NO: 10. The specification and claim do not indicate what distinguishing attributes shared by the members of the genus. Thus, the scope of the claim includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification and claim do not provide any guidance as to what changes should be made. Structural features that could distinguish compounds in the genus from others in the protein class are missing from the disclosure. No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. The general knowledge and level of skill in the art do not supplement the omitted description because specific, not general, guidance is what is needed. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, a nucleic acid with a sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 10, and the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 9 is insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Art Unit: 1646

Conclusion

Claims 46-48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 61-67, 75-78 are objected to.

Claims 40-45, 49-51, 54-59, 68-74 are rejected.

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph F. Murphy whose telephone number is 703-305-7245. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 703-308-6564. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Joseph F. Murphy, Ph. D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1646
October 15, 2002